



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(CONTINUING HEBRAICA)

VOLUME XXX

JANUARY 1914

NUMBER 2

THE COMPOSITION OF JUDGES, CHAP. 19

BY JULIUS A. BEWER

Union Theological Seminary, New York City

We have become so accustomed in the literary criticism of the Old Testament to apply the master-key of composite authorship to books or chapters which present perplexing literary problems, that we sometimes forget to inquire whether the facts in the particular case really demand its application. Of course, the difficulties and perplexities in the narrative may be removed and the literary problems may be "solved" by it. But the question remains whether this particular treatment actually unties or merely cuts the knots. Some minds will always prefer the more radical solution, if they are given the choice, others the more conservative. But the literary critic ought not to ask which solution is radical and which conservative and then decide according to his temperamental inclination, but which solution does most justice to all the facts in the case. Sometimes a surgical operation is imperative, sometimes the difficulty will yield to a sympathetic treatment of the text. Personally it ought not to make the slightest difference to the critic which method is to be applied. Only, before proceeding to a major operation he ought to be satisfied by the symptoms that there is no other way that promises permanent relief.

In the treatment of the literary questions of Judges, chap. 19, Budde, Moore, and Nowack resort to the theory of the combination of two sources, when as a matter of fact the symptoms do not appear

to call for such a radical procedure. Moore expresses himself very cautiously: "It is possible that the older story was itself composite; 19, 5-15, in particular, give ground for this opinion."¹ He makes it, however, clear that he accepts this possibility as the best solution. Budde and Nowack are much more positive. Budde says, chap. 19 "goes clearly back to two sources,"² "the great redundancy in this section [19:1-10] makes the assumption of two sources a necessity."³ Similarly Nowack asserts "there can be no doubt that chap. 19 is not a uniform presentation."⁴ "It is impossible . . . to get on with the assumption of a mere working over of one source."⁵ This solution has been accepted, e.g., by Cornill, Kittel, and Steuernagel, and may almost be regarded as a part of the critical tradition. A refutation must therefore needs go into a detailed examination of the evidence.

The case for vss. 5-9 has been stated by Moore as follows:⁶

"In v. 5-9 the Levite is several times on the point of setting out, but is over and over again persuaded to postpone his departure. The lingering of the narrative, the multiplication of identical or equivalent phrases, the alternation of singular and plural verbs, and especially the doublets in v. 9, give ground for the surmise that two versions of the story have been united; but the attempts to analyze the verses have not been successful. The solution which appears to me most plausible is, that in the first account the Levite remains three days with his father-in-law; on the fourth day, as he is preparing to depart, his host persuades him to fortify himself for the journey by a meal; they linger over the table till afternoon, when, declining an urgent invitation to spend another night, the Levite with his companions sets out on his return (v. 4-6a. 8a^a b. 9). In the other version they feast together on the day of the Levite's arrival (v. 6a); the girl's father invites his guest to pass the night there; in the morning he urges him to stay another night; on the third day detains him for a feast, as in the other account, and reluctantly allows him to depart, late in the day (v. 6. 7. 8a. 9)."

In regard to the doublets in vs. 9 which "especially" give ground for the surmise, Moore has himself shown that "the Hebrew text is not intact" and has restored on the basis of L^{al} the reading, See

¹ In his English translation of the Book of Judges, *SBOT*, 1898, pp. 92 f.; similarly in his *Commentary*, 1895, and last in his *Literature of the Old Testament*, 1912, p. 86, "with perhaps traces of another version in c. 19."

² *Das Buch der Richter*, 1897, p. 126.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

⁴ *Buch der Richter*, 1900, p. 157.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

⁶ *Commentary*, p. 410.

the day has declined toward evening; spend the night here to-day also, and enjoy thyself. And in his English translation, as well as in his edition of the Hebrew text in *SBOT*, Moore prints vs. 9 as coming from *one* source.

"The lingering of the narrative" as well as "the multiplication of identical or equivalent phrases" cannot be denied, but the question is whether this description is not altogether true to life. It is certain that similar situations with quite as many attempts on the part of the guest to leave and quite as many attempts on the part of the host to persuade him to stay occur not only in the Orient but also in Europe, if not in America, especially in connection with visits of relatives in the country. We must not overlook that after all the father-in-law is successful in persuading the Levite to stay only one full day after he had made up his mind to start for home. His attempt on the following day is only partially successful. The Levite insists on leaving that afternoon.

As for "the multiplication of identical or equivalent phrases" of which Moore speaks, was it not quite natural that the father-in-law should use the same phrase on the morning of the fourth and fifth days? Would we in a similar situation vary the particular phrase that we are accustomed to? Would not most of us say it in the same way twice, or if we varied at all vary it but slightly? Our author actually does vary it a little; in vs. 5 he says, *Stay thy stomach with a bit of bread and after that thou mayst go*; in vs. 8 he says simply, *Stay thy stomach*. If that was the phrase that he was accustomed to, why should he use another, especially if he varies it a little? Again the other attempts to persuade the Levite to stay are not phrased altogether alike; in vs. 6 the father-in-law says, *Be persuaded, now, and pass the night, and be merry*; in vs. 9, *See, the day is declined toward evening; pass the night here to-day also, and be merry*. What else should he have said the second time? He wanted him to stay over night, and לַיִל was the usual term for that. That he should have added on both occasions *and be merry*, which would correspond to our colloquial, *have a good time*, seems to me so utterly natural that I can conceive of myself as doing exactly the same thing. It is interesting to notice that on the first of these two days the author says (vs. 7) *his father-in-law urged him*. Nothing is said of this on

the second day (vs. 9). The author does therefore vary his description after all.

But what about "the alternation of singular and plural verbs"? In vs. 5 we read, *on the fourth day they arose in the morning and he stood up to go*. Moore remarks on this: "If the words belong to the original narrative, the [second] verb should probably be put in the plural." He might just as well have said that the first verb should be put in the singular, as we have it in vs. 8. And that is what we must do, just as *and after that ye may go* at the end of vs. 5 should be put in the singular, as Moore also quietly does in his translation. It was such an easy thing for a copyist to write the plural in this verse after he had written in vs. 4, *and they passed the night there*, when he should have written *and he passed the night there*, as in vs. 7. But immediately before there stood *and they ate and drank*, and so he wrote *and they passed the night there*. Then he went on, *and it came to pass on the fourth day when they rose in the morning*.

In vs. 8 Moore believes that the text should probably be restored on the basis of Greek MSS to read *and he coaxed him, and he lingered till the day was declining*, instead of *and tarry till the decline of day*. If this restoration is accepted, "the alternation of singular and plural verbs" disappears in this verse. But Moore's reasoning on the inappropriateness of the imperative *tarry!* is not really cogent. He says, "an invitation to tarry till afternoon before beginning a long journey is in itself strange, and appears still more strange beside v. 9, where the advanced hour of the day is urged as a reason why they should not set out till the following morning" (p. 411). That a man who wished to persuade another to prolong his visit should have said, *tarry till the day decline*, and that he should then have said in the afternoon, *see, the day has declined toward evening; spend the night here to-day also*, is again so altogether true to life that it seems strange that it should be made an argument for a change of text. It is exactly as ordinary people act everywhere. The only change that is really necessary is the slight emendation of the plural into the singular, which, as we said, is advocated in Moore's emendation also.

There is still another point which leads even Ehrlich to resort to the explanation of an editorial combination of two sources. It is the use of the two synonymous terms *the girl's father* and *his father-in-law*.

One source used the one, the other source the other and the editor sometimes combined both. In vss. 3, 5, 6, 8 we have *the girl's father*; in vs. 7 we have *his father-in-law*; in vss. 4, 9 we have both terms *his father-in-law, the girl's father*. It will hardly be maintained that the same author might not use both terms for the sake of variety of expression. But it is fairly certain that he would not use the two synonyms together, as is done in vss. 4, 9. One of them is not original. And it is quite certainly *the girl's father*. In Hebrew הָתָנוּ may be read either הָתָנוּ, *his father-in-law*, or הָתָנוּ, *his son-in-law*, and both readings occur in our passage (cf. vs. 5, *son-in-law*). In order that there might be no mistake in an unpointed text a reader added in vs. 4 to הָתָנוּ the explanatory *the girl's father*, which made it evident who was meant, and similarly in vs. 9. The translation of the Vulgate shows that this was not altogether unnecessary. It translated בִּרְחֹק בִּי in vs. 4 by *he embraced the man, amplexatus est hominem*. While it does not seem likely that this points to an original בִּרְחֹק instead of רְחֹק, because רְחֹק is used with ל and not with ב and the Vulgate is quite free in this chapter, yet a reader might have taken בִּרְחֹק in the same sense and connected it with the following (as the Massoretic text does, but not the Vulgate), and then it would be almost equally good to translate *and his father-in-law embraced him or his son-in-law embraced him*. If now we omit *the girl's father* in vss. 4, 9 as secondary, as Budde also does, since he regards it as editorial, we have a beautiful sequence in the story, *the girl's father* in vss. 3, 5, 6, 8 alternating with *his father-in-law* in vss. 4, 7, 9, in strict obedience to a stylistic rule.

There is one point where further criticism seems to be needed. We recognized in vs. 4 that the last two words had reference only to the Levite, for it was self-evident that the father-in-law should pass the night at his home. But now we notice that in the other two instances where both feast together this is indicated by the addition of *both of them together* (vs. 6) or of *both of them* (vs. 8). So we may conclude with reasonable assurance that the verbs in vs. 4b were originally all in the singular.

The specific mentioning of the fact that *he spent the night there* is a little peculiar after the statement that *he stayed with him three days*. It would seem to exclude the previous mention of three days

in vs. 4. That would carry with it the secondary character of *on the fourth day* in vs. 5 and *on the fifth day* in vs. 8; the latter had also been regarded as editorial by Moore. A reader, so we might say, wrote as a gloss on *he stayed with him* in vs. 4 *three days*, which he had figured out according to the Hebrew way of counting. The day of arrival was the first, the day of feasting the second, the day of departure the third day. After *three days* had been inserted in vs. 4, the insertion of the fourth and fifth days respectively in vss. 5, 8 followed almost as a matter of course. But even though לַיִל means *spend the night* in vss. 7, 9, there is no reason why it should not mean *lodge* in vs. 4. And the visit of three days is so customary even now, that it is exactly what we should expect. The father-in-law liked his guest so much that he urged him to stay another day, and then still another. The text is therefore true to life, and neither the *three days* in vs. 4, nor the *fourth* and *fifth day* in vss. 5, 8 should be omitted.

If we now read over vss. 4-10, we shall find the story quite consistent.

4. And his father-in-law detained him and he stayed with him three days; and he ate and drank and lodged there. 5. And on the fourth day, when he rose in the morning and was about to go, the girl's father said to his son-in-law, Stay thy stomach with a bit of bread, and after that thou mayst go. 6. So the two sat down and ate together and drank. And the girl's father said to the man, Be persuaded, now, and pass the night and be merry! 7. And when the man rose to go, his father-in-law urged him, and he spent the night there again. 8. And on the fifth day, when he rose in the morning to go, the girl's father said, Stay thy stomach, and tarry till the decline of day! And the two ate together. 9. And when the man rose to go, with his concubine and his servant, his father-in-law said to him, See, the day is declined toward evening, pass the night here to-day also, and be merry; then thou mayst rise early to-morrow morning for thy journey and go to thy home. 10. But the man refused to spend the night and rose and went, and came to a point opposite Jebus [i.e., Jerusalem], having a pair of asses, his concubine, and his servant¹ with him.

In the next section, vss. 11-15, the text, as we have it, gives reason for the statement that vs. 13 excludes vss. 11, 12 before itself (Budde). In vss. 11, 12 the servant proposes to his master that they spend the night at Jerusalem, but the master declines, because

¹ For עַמּוּר read יְבֻזָּר.

Jerusalem was not an Israelitish city, and in turn proposes that they keep on and spend the night at Gibeah. In vs. 13 he is uncertain whether they should stay at Ramah or Gibeah. The sunset decides the matter in favor of Gibeah. The *crux* lies in vs. 12b. Here, however, the text is not in order. Moore already noted "that the adversative after a negative sentence (we will not do so, but so) should be expressed by simple consecutive perfect, instead of by **אם** or **כִּי אם** is striking," and he added: "The words read very much like a gloss suggested by the following (v. ^{14f})." If this solution is correct, the two-source theory loses its real foundation in this instance too. But why should such a gloss be introduced here? We must look for the solution elsewhere. The word immediately preceding vs. 12b, **וְהָנָה**, is certainly corrupt, as is generally agreed. But the reading of some Hebrew MSS, **וְהַיָּמָה**, which is followed by modern critics, is nothing but a correction and does not witness to an older text. It necessitates the further change of **נָכְרִי** to **נָכְרִים** in order that it may have a true antecedent. This latter change to *a city of foreigners who are no Israelites* is sound, but the change of **וְהָנָה** to **וְהַיָּמָה** does not seem altogether satisfying, especially in view of vs. 12b. When the travelers approached Jerusalem, *the day was already far spent* (vs. 11); that was the reason for the servant's suggestion. But the hour of sunset had not yet come. So they journeyed on until they were compelled by *the sun setting down on them when they were beside Gibeah* (vs. 14) to turn in there for shelter. This suggests that the master said in vs. 12, *We will not turn aside to a city of foreigners who are no Israelites. Come, let us pass on till sun-down!* For **וְהָנָה וְעִבְרָנוּ** the original text read **וְהָנָה וְעִבְרָה עַד הָעֶרֶב**. This solves the difficulty of the **וְהָנָה**, of the waw consecutive with the perfect and of the omission of the article before **גִּבְעָה**. Elsewhere in chaps. 19, 20 the latter is always defined, except in 20:31, 33 where the text is generally regarded as not correctly preserved by the Massora. This should have given rise to suspicion also in this verse. A glance at the emended text shows how easily it could be corrupted to our received text. The restored text contains just what is needed at this point of the narrative.

If this is accepted, we have in vs. 13 not a parallel but the continuation of vss. 11, 12. The master makes his proposal that

they pass on till sundown, more definite by specifying Ramah or Gibeah as stopping places. This is introduced afresh by *and he said to his servant*.

Vs. 15 is distributed among two sources by Budde, Moore, and Nowack. But only Nowack finds it necessary to remark about it. Vs. 15a, according to him, is redundant, since לְבוֹא is superfluous beside יָבֵא. Yet Nowack himself is unwilling to agree to Budde's assignment of לְבוֹא לָלוֹן בְּנִבְעָה as the continuation of וַיַּעֲבֵרוּ in vs. 14, which, by the way, is regarded by both Budde and Nowack, but not by Moore, as a parallel to וַיֵּלֶכְיָא and therefore clearly from another source! But what reason is there then for two sources? Moore gives no reason. Can it be that he thinks that "the alternation of singular and plural verbs" of which he spoke in connection with vss. 5-9 has influenced him here? Hardly, because he leaves it in the source to which he assigns vs. 14 (plural) as well as vs. 15b (singular). Budde and Nowack do not remove this alternation of singular and plural verbs in their sources either. So Budde reads for his first source, *So they turned aside there, and he entered*, etc. It is, however, fairly certain, irrespective of any theory of composition, that the original text read the plural all through vs. 15. The internal evidence is strengthened here by the external evidence of §§ V.

It is necessary now to read over the text of vss. 11-15 in order to test the validity of these observations in their connection.

11. Now when they were near Jebus and the day was far spent, the servant said to his master, Come, let us turn aside to this Jebusite town and spend the night in it. 12. But his master said to him, We will not turn aside to a city of foreigners who are no Israelites. Come now, let us pass on until sun-down. 13. And he said to his servant, Come, let us draw up to one of those places and spend the night in Gibeah or in Ramah. 14. So they continued their way and the sun went down on them as they were beside Gibeah, which belongs to Benjamin. 15. So they turned aside there in order to enter and spend the night in Gibeah. And they entered, and sat down in the market place of the city. And no one invited them into his house to spend the night.

We might stop here because the really significant verses and the difficulties in them which have given rise to the two-source theory have been discussed. Moreover, Moore and Kittel do not find any more traces of the two sources in chap. 19. Budde and Nowack, however, believe that they can point out at least some.

In vss. 16–21 there is only one place, vs. 18, where the two sources are woven together according to them. Vs. 18 reads: *We are passing through from Bethlehem in Judah to the distant parts of Mount Ephraim. I came thence, and went to Bethlehem in Judah, and I am now going to my home.*¹ It is extremely difficult to see what it is that calls for the assumption of two sources. Nowack says, “vs. 18 $\alpha\beta a$ is probably parallel to vs. 18 $a a$.” But is it really? In the first sentence the man says, we are on our way from Bethlehem in Judah to a certain place on Mount Ephraim. In the second sentence he gives the added information, that the place is his home; he had made a trip from there to Bethlehem and was now returning home. If he had not added this, the old man would not have known that the man’s home was on Mount Ephraim. The various parts of the verse belong therefore together and form a coherent whole. The assumption of a combination of two sources is altogether uncalled for here.

In vss. 22–30 Budde, followed by Nowack, points to a number of parallel phrases and says: “By no means can all these double terms be due merely to redundancy of expression” (p. 131). The first pair of these terms is **אֲנָשֵׁי הָעִיר** and **אֲנָשֵׁי בְנֵי בְלִיעֵל** in vs. 22. The second term is peculiar and is either a conflation in which case **אֲנָשֵׁי** is to be omitted (cf. \mathfrak{G}^{AB}), or the text read originally **אֲנָשִׁים בְּנֵי בְלִיעֵל** (cf. 20:13; Deut. 13:14; I Kings 21:10 [Moore]). Budde, who accepts the latter, deduces from it that according to one source the men of Gibeah as a whole were made responsible for the outrage, as in Gen. 19:4; according to the other, only a band of scoundrels (cf. 20:13). There is no trace in the sequel that all the men of Gibeah were involved. The author of Gen., chap 19, is careful to make it as plain as possible that he means *all* the male inhabitants of the city, by adding a clause to that effect. Here the addition of **אֲנָשִׁים בְּנֵי בְלִיעֵל** appears to be intended to express just the opposite, the men of the city (i.e.), *certain vile scoundrels*. If we omit **אֲנָשֵׁי** as due to the conflation of two readings, we have no difficulty whatever and no reason for speaking of parallel terms. This is a little easier, because in all the other cases (20:13; Deut. 13:14; I Kings 21:10) **בְּנֵי בְלִיעֵל** qualifies **אֲנָשִׁים** or **הָאֲנָשִׁים**; here it would qualify **אֲנָשֵׁי הָעִיר**. Besides, it has the support of \mathfrak{G}^{AB} . But in either case we have no evidence of a combination of two accounts.

¹ Read **וְאֶת־בֵּית יְהוָה** for **וְאֶת־בֵּית יְהוָה** with \mathfrak{G} . So Moore, Budde, Nowack, Kittel.

Why the clauses *they gathered about the house and pounding¹ against the door* should "in any case" (Nowack) lead one to assume two sources is again difficult to understand. Of course, it may be granted readily enough that *they gathered about the house* is not absolutely necessary, but that is no cogent argument for assigning it to another author. Besides, is not the use of the participle here most effective: *they had gathered about the house and were pounding against the door?*

The hospitable old man is called **הָאִישׁ הַזֶּקֶן** in vss. 16, 17, 20, and **הָאִישׁ בְּעַל הַבַּיִת** in vss. 22, 23. But Ehrlich has already noticed that he could not be called *the owner of the house* before the guest had entered. When he is in the house, the ruffians speak to *the old owner of the house*. To identify him the author has added the designation *old* the first time he calls him *owner of the house*, but after that it was not necessary (cf. vs. 23). Far from being an evidence of two sources, of which the one called him *the old man* the other *the owner of the house*, this variation is most appropriate and shows that our author liked to vary his phrases.

It is hardly worth while to take up the other parallels, for they are of the same kind and would be significant only if the theory of two sources had been proved at the crucial points in vss. 5-15. If it had been proved, it would be possible or even probable that various parallel expressions in the second part of the chapter came from these two different sources. But to our mind it has not been proved. The remaining instances are so little convincing that Nowack introduces them by "perhaps" (vss. 25, 26, 28) or by "*wohl*" (vs. 27). Only on vs. 24 he speaks more confidently.

We owe to Budde the restoration of the original text of vs. 24, for he has proved that *his concubine* is inserted and that the suffixes must all be changed from the—also grammatically impossible—plural masculine to the feminine singular. So we must read, *Behold, here is my virgin daughter, I will bring her out, and you may ravish her, and do with her as you please, but to this man you must not do this wanton deed*. The phrases *you may ravish her* and *you may do with her as you please* are regarded as parallel and referred to two sources.

¹ The hithpa'el is peculiar; elsewhere the *Kal* is used. Perhaps **מֵת** is due to dittography (cf. the preceding **בֵּית**), or we may read with Ehrlich **מֵתִירָפִים**, *leaning* (heavily) against the door.

But here, as well as in vs. 25, the terms are not strictly synonymous and the two-source theory is uncalled for.

Another question is involved in vs. 24. Moore, following Bertheau, regarded vs. 24 as an insertion based on Gen., chap. 19. He says (p. 418): "Bertheau thinks that the whole verse has been interpolated from Gen. 19⁸, with which it is almost verbally identical: there is no allusion to this offer in the sequel; the connexion and movement of the narrative would be better if v. ²⁵ immediately followed v. ²³; some grammatical irregularities are also pointed out. Such an addition, bringing the story into still closer agreement with Gen. 19, would be entirely natural; the resemblance between the two verses is too mechanical to be the result of mere reminiscence." That there is no allusion to this offer in the sequel is not strange; where should it have been alluded to? The summary in 20:5 contains only the essential points, and rightly. The grammatical irregularities are removed by Budde's reconstruction of vs. 24. That "the connexion and movement of the narrative would be better if v. ²⁵ immediately followed v. ²³" Budde and Nowack are unwilling to admit. They believe that the double text in vs. 24 argues for its retention. Besides, they are convinced that the scoundrels intended to have the concubine, not the Levite, from the very beginning. Their lust was incited by the beauty of the woman. So Budde and Nowack read in vs. 22, following Doorninck, *Bring out the woman . . . that we may know her*. But the text says nothing of the woman's beauty and Moore's objection that "if Doorninck's restoration be accepted, there is nothing in ch. 19 to intimate that the man was in any way molested or threatened, and 20⁵ is left without any foundation" (p. 417), has not really been answered. However, his point that the omission of vs. 24 would give a better connection and movement of the narrative loses its weight with Budde's restoration of the original text. There remains thus only the assertion that "the resemblance between the two verses [Judg. 19:24 and Gen. 19:8] is too mechanical to be the result of mere reminiscence." But this might reasonably be urged against vss. 22, 23 also. If it holds good against the one, why not against the others also?

Ultimately it is a historical consideration that decides this matter. If we regard the incident as historical, our inclination will be to

remove certain points in the narrative which resemble Gen., chap. 19, so much that they cannot be independent of it. . If, however, we do not take the incident as history, our principal motive for removing those striking points of resemblance disappears. It is evident, therefore, that the historical criticism of the whole story, chaps. 19-21, must come first, before this point is settled.

The same is true of another point of considerable interest which may now be considered. Budde believes (and Nowack agrees with him) that the original story did not speak of a *Levite*,¹ (1) because the levitical character of the man is of no significance in the story and nothing is said of a corresponding occupation, (2) because *the Levite* occurs only twice in the story (19:1; 20:4) where it is accompanied by *man* or *the man*, which is the term used of him everywhere else. Budde thinks therefore that a later editor inserted the *Levite* in order to conform our story to that of chaps. 17, 18. Not only the similarity of the localities (Bethlehem in Judah and Mount Ephraim) influenced him, but also the desire to make the crime appear to a later time all the more heinous by having it committed against a Levite. But is it really without significance for the story that the man against whom the crime was committed was a Levite? If he had been an Ephraimite the sequel of the story would have been different. In that case he would have appealed for vengeance to his own clan or tribe, but not to all Israel. We know too well from ancient Semite and also Israelite antiquity that this would have been the procedure. But here was a man who could not do that; he had no clan or tribe to appeal to, since he was a Levite. So as a member of the nation he called upon all the Israelites. What was natural in the case of a Levite would by no means have been so in the case of an Ephraimite. The point that the man was a Levite is therefore of real significance for the story. It also makes his marriage with a Bethlehemite concubine a little more natural, if he was from Bethlehem himself; though it is of course not inconceivable that an Ephraimite should have married a woman from Bethlehem. And as for a non-Levitical Judean from

¹ It is strange to read in Moore's *Commentary* on 19:1, "it has been observed above [p. 371] that all the Levites mentioned in ch. 17, 18, 19-21 are in some way connected with Judah, and two of them with Bethlehem." Why is a distinction made between *all* the Levites connected with Judah and the *two* connected with Bethlehem, when the *two* are *all* the Levites mentioned in these chapters?

Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II², 1909, p. 73, goes to the other extreme when he says, "the single Levite, whom we meet in the Book of Judges, comes from Judah."

Bethlehem, he would not have been represented as living in a remote place of Mount Ephraim without some explanation. After the recognition of the significance of the Levite for the story the other arguments are not of sufficient strength to support Budde's theory. That **אִישׁ** should have been added in 19:1 is entirely in line with Hebrew usage, and why **וַיְהִי אִישׁ לְרֵי גֵר**, and *a man of Levi was residing*, should be an awkward expression is difficult to see, for the use of **וַיְהִי** with the participle is surely good Hebrew. Why then should we expect, as Budde claims, **וַהֲוָה גֵר שָׁם**, or **וַהֲוָה גֵר שָׁם** after **אֲפֵרִים**?

And yet Budde may after all be right in his suggestion that the *Levite* is a secondary element in the story. But it is not literary but historical considerations that lead to such an assumption. Historically it is very improbable that the man should have sent his appeal to all the tribes of Israel and that even representatives of all the tribes, not to think of the entire army of 400,000 (!), should have gathered against Gibeah. From all we know of Israel at this period, that is simply inconceivable. If there was therefore actually an expedition against Gibeah, it is much more likely that only the Joseph tribes (Israel in the narrower sense) should have taken part in it. If we regard chap. 19, with most recent critics, as a trustworthy historical narrative, we must look upon *the Levite* in vs. 1 and *the twelve pieces* in vs. 29 as interpolations on the part of the writer who in chap. 20 speaks of an expedition of the united army of all the tribes of Israel. The Levite is then not simply due to the desire of someone who wanted to bring chaps. 17, 18 and chaps. 19–21 into closer connection, as Budde thinks, but it is the well-conceived interpolation of the writer of chap. 20. *All the border of Israel* in vs. 29 referred then originally to Israel in the narrower sense, the Joseph tribes on Mount Ephraim. If, on the other hand, chap. 19 is a part of an unhistorical tale, we have no reason whatever to regard either *the Levite* in vs. 1 or *the twelve pieces* in vs. 29 as interpolations, and *the whole territory of Israel* is to be explained in harmony with chap. 20.

These questions can be decided only after an investigation of chaps. 20, 21, which will be the subject of our next essay. They must, however, not obscure *the outcome of our present investigation, that chap. 19 is not the result of a combination of two sources*, as Budde, Moore, Nowack, and others claim.